

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12 Plaintiff-Respondent,  
13 v.  
14 LAWRENCE ROBINSON,  
15 Defendant-Movant.  
16

Case No. 1:97-cr-05129-JLT-3

ORDER STAYING CASE

(Doc. 437)

17 On June 29, 2021, the previously assigned district judge denied Lawrence Robinson's  
18 motions brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 and declined to issue a certificate of appealability. (Doc.  
19 436.) On July 8, 2021, Defendant requested reconsideration of denial of a certificate of  
20 appealability, citing to the pending case of *United States v. Taylor*, No. 20-1459 (certiorari  
21 granted July 2, 2021), which remains pending before the U.S. Supreme Court. (Doc. 437.)  
22 Defendant also requested the Court stay the instant case pending a determination by the Supreme  
23 Court in *Taylor*. (*Id.* at 1-2.) A routine review of the docket of this case reveals that the Court has  
24 yet to formally respond to the stay request.

25 The Court **GRANTS** Defendant's request to stay this case pending the Supreme Court's  
26 resolution in *Taylor* because the outcome of *Taylor* may affect the Court's determination  
27 regarding the request for reconsideration of the denial of certificate of appealability. *See Landis v.*  
28 *N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) ("[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the

1 power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy  
2 of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.”). In particular, the issue presented in  
3 *Taylor* concerns whether attempted Hobbs Act robbery is a crime of violence under 18 U.S.C.  
4 § 924(c)(3). The Ninth Circuit previously held that attempted Hobbs Act robbery constituted a  
5 crime of violence under the statute. *See United States v. Dominguez*, 954 F.3d 1251, 1262 (9th  
6 Cir. 2020). If the Supreme Court reaches a different conclusion in *Taylor*, this Court’s decision  
7 regarding Defendant’s motion for reconsideration may be impacted because Defendant’s case  
8 likewise involves a conviction of aiding and abetting under 18 U.S.C. § 924. (*See* Doc. 437 at 2.)  
9 For these reasons and because the Government did not oppose the request to stay, this case is  
10 hereby **STAYED**. The parties are instructed to file a joint status report within fourteen days of the  
11 Supreme Court issuing a final decision in *Taylor*.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: **June 13, 2022**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE